



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

SPECIAL TOWN MEETING #1 FIANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENATIONS

May 2, 2017

Greetings to all Town Meeting Members and Citizens of Natick,

This is the Finance Committee Recommendation Book for the 2017 Special Town Meeting #1 commencing on May 9, 2017.

These recommendations are for Articles 1-4 of the 2017 Special Town Meeting #1 Warrant.

Finance Committee held a public hearing on May 1, 2017. As is our practice the Finance Committee took testimony, asked questions and received information from the sponsors on the subject matter of the articles. Finance Committee also heard from citizens during the public comments and questions portion of the public hearing. Finance Committee entered into debate on each Article and voted motions.

The following pages provide a summary of the public hearing and include the Finance Committee recommendations.

Respectfully,

Patrick Hayes
Finance Committee Chair



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

ARTICLE 1

Amendments to the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law and Zoning Map (Town Administrator)

To see if the Town will vote to:

- 1) Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, by rezoning from Industrial II (INII) to Highway Mixed Use I (HMI) or other zoning district as appropriate the following properties:
 - a.) Town of Natick Assessors' Map 17, Lot 8, including approximately to the center line of Route 9 to the south [including but not limited to a portion of the property known as 1185 Worcester Street]
 - b.) Town of Natick Assessors' Map 17, Lots 10, 11, 12; Map 25, Lots 252A, 252B, 253, 253A, 253B; and Map 26 Lot 168C; including approximately to the center line of Route 9 to the south [including but not limited to properties known as 1065-1085 Worcester Street]; and including the portion of Lake Cochituate surrounded by these lots;
- 2) Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, by rezoning from Highway Corridor (HC) Overlay District to Regional Center (RC) Overlay District or other overlay district as appropriate, the following properties:
 - a) Town of Natick Assessors' Map 17, Lots 10, 11, and 12; Map 25, Lots 252A, 252B, 253, 253A, 253B; and Map 26 Lot 168C; including approximately to the center line of Route 9 to the south; and including the portion of Lake Cochituate surrounded by these lots;
- 3) Amend the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law, Section III-B (3), (4), and (5) regarding Large Parcels, by amending and/or altering the minimum parcel threshold for Large Parcels;
- 4) Amend the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law, Section II-B Location of Districts, by deleting and/or amending any or all subsections from subsection 7 to the end of Section II-B;

or otherwise act thereon.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE

The purposes of these proposed zoning amendments are to:

- Replace the Highway Corridor (HC) Overlay District with the Regional Center (RC) Overlay District on Worcester St. (RT. 9) certain lots;
- Amend Section II-B Location of Districts to remove all sections including subsection 7 to the end of Section II-B.

FINANCE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The sponsor of the article was represented by the Director of Community and Economic Development who spoke to the purpose, need and merits of the proposed Zoning By-Law change.

The proposed zoning article and map changes were previously discussed at length by the Planning Board and identified as items that needed to be completed to “clean up” the zoning map and zoning bylaw.

- The need to complete these in a timely manner is in order to support the redevelopment of a soon-to-be vacated/underutilized warehouse property zoned for industrial use.
- The amendment will encourage higher value, contextually sensitive commercial uses, which are consistent with considerable feedback received/expressed throughout the Natick 2030+ Master Plan process thus far and throughout the Targeted Economic Development Plan work, recently completed by the Economic Development Committee.
- Public meetings were held with the Planning Board (including the required public hearings) and Board of Selectmen. Notification was also sent to the Economic Development Committee – all are supportive of the proposed amendments
- Based on concerns expressed by several individuals after the Special Town Meeting #1 Warrant closed and further consideration by the Director of Community and Economic Development, it was determined that it was not necessary and/or prudent to change the underlying zoning of these properties at this time.

The timing of the proposed change is driven in part by the possible redevelopment of the properties highlighted in the warrant article to support a natural transition of the property from one owner to another and one defined use to another in the near-term

- Failing to enact this zoning change now may limit the current and/or potential future owner from developing the property as desired



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

- The potential future owner - an existing Natick business - is seeking possible consolidation and substantial expansion of their operations (currently located in Natick and one other Massachusetts community)
- Their space requirements indicate the need for a 60,000 +/- square foot facility to serve as their east coast headquarters; a Silicon Valley location serves as their main headquarters

Finance Committee heard testimony from the sponsor, which indicates that for the property in question:

- Extending the RC district to this property will allow a density increase of up to .50 from .32 FAR through a SPGA process and Site Plan Review

Further testimony from the sponsor on the subject of deleting subsection 7 to the end of Section II-B in the Zoning By-Laws doesn't invalidate the language or remove or change the definitions of any overlay district or zoning district.

- The language continues to be embodied in the Zoning Map itself
- A record of the changes to the Zoning Map and the Zoning By-laws are retained in the Town Report and also are on file in the Community and Economic Development office for public access and reference
- The current version of the Zoning Map, the use of the GIS systems and the level of detail and specificity of the map itself and the supporting databases make the language in subsection 7 unnecessary
- Since the by-law currently includes descriptions of only some (not all) zoning districts and/or changes, it is very confusing and possibly misleading
- Town Counsel is not aware of any other community that includes these descriptors in its Zoning By-Law

FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Finance Committee recommends the following action supported by its vote for the motion as presented below.

Article #1	Date	Action	Vote
	May 1, 2017	Favorable Action	13-0-0

Motion: (Requires a two-thirds majority)

Move that the zoning bylaws be amended as follows:



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

-
- 1) **Amend the Town of Natick Zoning Map, as referenced in the Town of Natick Zoning By-Law under Section II-B Location of Districts (Zones) subsection 1, by rezoning from Highway Corridor (HC) Overlay District to Regional Center (RC) Overlay District the following properties:**
 - a. **Town of Natick Assessors' Map 17, Lots 10, 11, and 12; Map 25, Lots 252A, 252B, 253, 253A, 253B; and Map 26 Lot 168C; including approximately to the center line of Route 9 to the south; and including the portion of Lake Cochituate surrounded by these lots;**

 - 2) **Delete the text of Section II-B Location of Districts after subsection 6.**

As amended Section II-B Location of Districts shall read:

II-B LOCATION OF DISTRICTS (Zones)

1. **Said districts (Paragraph II-A above) are located and bounded as shown on a map entitled "Zoning Map of Natick, Massachusetts.", on file in the offices of the Town Clerk and Town Planning Board dated February 10, 1960. The Zoning Map, with all explanatory matter thereon, is hereby made a part of this bylaw and shall be re-issued annually by the Planning Board to incorporate such amendments as may be made by Town Meeting action and approved as required by the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.**

2. **Where a boundary is shown as following a street, railroad or utility, the boundary shall be the center line thereon unless otherwise indicated.**

3. **Where a boundary is shown outside of a street, railroad or utility and approximately parallel thereto, the boundary shall be deemed parallel to the center line thereof, and the figure placed on the zoning map between the boundary and such line shall be the distance in feet between them, as measured at a right angle from such line unless otherwise indicated.**

4. **Where a boundary is shown as following a water-course, the boundary shall coincide with the center line thereof as said line existed at the date of the zoning map.**

5. **Where the location of a boundary line is otherwise uncertain, the Building Inspector shall determine its position in accordance with the**



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

distance in feet from other lines as given or as measured from the scale.

- 6. Where a boundary is shown as following a contour line, this line shall be the contour line of the indicated elevation above mean sea level as shown on all applicable topographic maps of Natick by the Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior, or any other Town accepted survey map, corrected to the U.S.G.S datum plane.**



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

ARTICLE 2

Application of Bond Premiums to Project Costs or Other Capital Projects (Town Administrator)

To see if the Town will vote to (i) appropriate the premium paid to the Town upon the sale of bonds issued on April 27, 2017 to pay costs of capital projects and to reduce the amounts appropriated for such projects by the same amount, and (ii) supplement each prior vote of the Town that authorizes the borrowing of money to pay costs of capital projects to provide that, in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, the premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes thereunder, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bond or notes, may be applied to pay project costs and the amount authorized to be borrowed for each such project shall be reduced by the amount of any such premium so applied; or otherwise act thereon.

PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE

The Town receives a premium on a bond sale, over and above the amount of bonds sold, derived from the excess funds generated in the reoffering of the bonds by the purchaser in the secondary market.

The use of premium in this way is now mandated by the Municipal Modernization Act, MGL c.44 sec.20, and its use in this manner automatically reduces the authorization amount of the bonds, so there are no excess funds being used for the project.

FINANCE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The sponsor provided information to the Finance Committee in their responses to the Questionnaire and in testimony during the Public Hearing including:

- The Town receives a premium on a bond sale, over and above the amount of bonds sold, derived from the excess funds generated in the reoffering of the bonds by the purchaser in the secondary market
- With interest rates expected to rise, purchasers put higher yield rates on the bonds than the coupons on the bonds, in order to provide coupon protection to investors should they sell their bonds before they mature.
- In exchange for this option, purchasers are willing to pay higher than par to purchase the bonds.
- This "excess" purchase price results in a "premium" paid to the issuer of the bonds.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

-
- It is highly effective to use the premium from the sale of bonds, to reduce how many bonds are actually sold, by a like amount.

For bonds issued subsequent to the enactment of the Municipal Modernization Act for which there was no authorization to appropriate the premium to reduce the sale of bonds, Town Meeting is required to appropriate the premium received from such sale of bonds to directly pay for the capital costs of those projects in lieu of selling bonds for that same amount.

- This is how the Town's most recent bond sale in April 2017, was sold. We reduced the amount of bonds sold by the amount, net of costs of issue, that the Town received in premium.
- Town Meeting is being asked to vote to appropriate that premium to the projects to complete the total financing costs authorized in the vote approving those bonds.

This vote is required to bring the debt authorized but not issued prior to November 2016 into compliance with the Municipal Modernization Act, MGL c.44 sec.20.

- This article is in concert with the provisions of MGL. c. 40 s. 20.
- It will amend each prior vote of the Town for authorized unissued debt to apply any and all premiums earned from the sales to pay costs of capital projects.
- The Town will not be in compliance with Municipal Modernization Act, MGL c.44 sec.20 for debt authorized but not issued prior to November 2016 if this is not approved by Town Meeting

During the public hearing questions were asked and answered and further information was provided including the following:

- Article 2 also seeks to authorize only one of the two equally eligible uses of bond premiums under the new law. A question was asked re: why had only one method been specified?
 - Article 2 (i) only authorizes the approval of application of the premiums to the projects costs because that is how the April 27, 2017 bond issue was configured.
 - Article 2 (ii), language for previously authorized but unissued debt does provide both options under section 20 with the use of the term "may." The bond issue of April 27, 2017 was partly necessitated by the need to pay expiring BANs so unfortunately the issue of premium application could not wait until after 2017 Special Town Meeting #1.
 - After consultation with the Town's financial advisors and bond counsel it was determined that application of the premiums to the project costs was the most fiscally prudent structure for the bond issue.
- Article language says that previous premiums "may" be applied to projects. Who



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

makes those decisions and why not Town Meeting.

- In essence Town Meeting will be making the determination by including the Section 20 language in the authorization vote. Practically the decision on how to apply the bond premiums must consider the borrowing environment and, given the restrictions placed on the use of bond premiums by Section 20, the availability of upcoming projects that could use the funding. These are factors that are difficult if not impossible to be realistically considered by Town Meeting whose authorizations are months and often years in advance of the borrowing.
- What is the financial analysis calculating the increase in interest payment on the bonds per year and determining at what point (year of interest payments) the cumulative costs of interest payment exceeds the \$1,468,000 premium? If it does not exceed the costs, what is the net position at end of bond period?
 - Over the life of the bonds there will be a \$464,892 reduction in interest costs and an aggregate reduction of overall debt service costs of \$1,932,892. See attached Bond Premium Application Analysis.

FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Finance Committee recommends the following action supported by its vote for the motion as presented below.

Article #2	Date	Action	Vote
	May 1, 2017	Favorable Action	12-0-0

MOTION: (requires two-thirds vote)

Move that the Town vote to (i) appropriate \$1,468,000 from the premium paid to the Town upon the sale of bonds issued on April 27, 2017 (the Bonds”) to pay costs, on a pro-rata basis, of the projects financed with the proceeds of such Bonds; and (ii) supplement each prior vote of the Town that authorizes the borrowing of money to pay costs of capital projects to provide that, in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, the premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes thereunder, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to pay project costs and the amount authorized to be borrowed for each such project shall be reduced by the amount of any such premium so applied.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

ARTICLE 3

Amend Zoning By-Laws: Reasonable Regulation of Uses Exempted from Permitting

(Cathleen Collins et al.)

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaws including but not limited to adding new sections and/or definitions, and/or amending existing sections and/or definitions and/or applying existing regulations in order to provide for Site Plan Review and reasonable regulations concerning the bulk and height of structures and determining yard size, lot area, setbacks, open space, parking, and building coverage requirements of land, structures, and uses as provided in and/or otherwise exempted from any local permitting and/or local zoning control per Massachusetts General Laws chapter 40A, section 3, the so-called Dover Amendment, relevant case law and/or other State or Federal statute; or otherwise act thereon.

PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE

This by-law is intended to provide for the reasonable regulation concerning the bulk and height of structures and determining yard size, lot area, setbacks, open space, parking, and building coverage requirements of land, structures, and uses otherwise exempted from local zoning requirements per MGL c.40A, section 3.

FINANCE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The sponsor provided the following information to Finance Committee:

- At the moment the Town has no by-law, and thus no way to review or impose reasonable regulations on, “Dover Use” projects.
 - These include, but are not limited to:
 - Churches, rectories, convents, parish houses, and other religious institutions (Use 47);
 - Schools, public, religious, sectarian, or private (Use 48);
 - Licensed nursery schools or other use for the day care of children, but not including day or summer private camps operated for profit (Use 49).
- In the sponsor’s testimony it was stated that the sponsor believes that this is why developers have felt free to say that, ‘if (the sought after development) can’t proceed then we’ll just put in a Dover project and you can’t regulate it.’ This was stated, in the sponsor’s presence, by a developer seeking a zoning change under articles on the 2017 SATM.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

- The Sponsor notes that this by-law is NOT intended to prohibit any otherwise exempted Use but rather to regulate the use as provided for in MGL c. 40A, section 3.
- If this by-law is passed, the Planning Board would have the authority and responsibility to perform a site plan review and ensure compliance for any “Dover” use “subject to the limitations of G.L. c. 40A, §3 or other State or Federal statute: “The Planning Board shall impose any such conditions, limitations, and safeguards as it deems appropriate to protect the interests of, and consistent with, the planning objectives for the underlying zoning district.”
 - This will stop cases where an applicant intends to construct, reconstruct, alter or convert a property for a “Dover” use and asserts the Town has no authority to review the size or site of such a project.
 - This problem has resulted in large projects on small parcels and created traffic congestion.
- MGL c. 40A, section 3 is silent on the issue of Site Plan Review and the specific question has never been answered by either the Massachusetts SJC or the Appeals Court.
 - However, in an unpublished opinion (*Jewish Cemetery Association of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Town of Wayland* (2010), Justice Sands (referring to *The Bible Speaks v. Board of Appeals of Lenox*) stated, “the Appeals Court held that the site plan/special permit bylaw at issue exceed the Dover Amendments allowance of reasonable regulations ... (however) such case does not stand for the proposition that all site plan review violates the Dover Amendment as an absolute matter of law. In light of the above, I find that uses protected by the Dover Amendment may be subject to site plan review as long as such review is limited to reasonable regulations.” Furthermore, he continued, since “the site plan review process implies regulation of a use rather than its prohibition (*YD Dugout, Inc. v. Board of Appeals of Canton*). It contemplates primarily the imposition, for the public protection, of reasonable terms and conditions” upon a permitted use.
- A similar Zoning By-Law Amendment is on the Wayland 2017 Annual Town Meeting Warrant to address regulation of uses otherwise exempted by MGL c. 40A section 3.
- The Town of Concord (*Zoning By-Law section 11.8.7*) requires Site Plan Review and was used, in part for the development of this proposal.
- Framingham and Westwood also include dimensional compliance and/or a site plan requirement, which was reviewed.

The Finance Committee heard further testimony, asked questions and received information from the sponsor and two citizens well-versed in zoning by-laws.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Finance Committee recommends the following action supported by its vote for the motion as presented below.

Article #3	Date	Action	Vote
	May 1, 2017	Favorable Action	10-0-0

MOTION (Requires two-thirds majority)

Move that the Zoning Bylaws be amended as follows:

-In Section III – USE REGULATIONS, following subsection III - A.6, add a new subsection as follows:

“III – A.7 Regulation of Land or Structures for Purposes Otherwise Exempted from Permitting

1. Purpose: To provide for the reasonable regulation of land and structures exempted from permitting by Massachusetts General Laws chapter 40A, §3, or other State or Federal statute.
2. Subject to the limitations of G.L. c. 40A, §3 or other State or Federal statute, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary, the development, redevelopment, alteration, or conversion of land or structures for such an exempted purpose shall be subject to Site Plan Review by the Planning Board per Section VI-DD 2B and the following:
 - a) In reviewing the site plan submittal made under this section, the following criteria shall be considered:
 - i. relationship of the bulk, height of structures, and adequacy of open spaces to the natural landscape, existing buildings and other community assets in the area, and compliance with other requirements of this Bylaw, which includes but is not limited to lot coverage, yard sizes, lot areas and setbacks;
 - ii. harmony of any proposed or potential incidental uses with the uses permitted in the underlying zoning district;
 - iii. physical layout of the structures, driveways, utilities and other infrastructure as it relates to the convenience and safety of vehicular and



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

- pedestrian movement on the site and in relation to streets and properties in the surrounding area, and for the location of driveway openings in relation to street traffic and to adjacent streets, so as to prevent traffic congestion and dangerous access within the site and onto existing ways, and when necessary, compliance with other requirements for the disabled, minors or the elderly;
- iv. adequacy of the arrangement of parking and loading areas in relation to the proposed use of the site;
 - v. physical lighting of the site, including the methods of exterior lighting for convenience, safety and security within the site, and in consideration of impacts on neighboring properties and excessive light pollution to the standards of Section V-I; and
 - vi. adequacy of measures for the prevention of pollution of surface and groundwater, soil erosion, increased runoff, changes in groundwater level and runoff, and conservation and recycling of water.
- b) Subject to the limitations of G.L. c. 40A, §3 or other State or Federal statute, the Planning Board shall impose any such conditions, limitations, and safeguards as it deems appropriate to protect the interests of, and consistent with, the planning objectives for the underlying zoning district.
3. Location: These purposes are limited to Lots that conform in: area, frontage, depth, and width; to the zoning district in which they are located.
4. Intensity Regulations:
- a) In all non-residential districts the intensity regulations shown on, or referenced in, Table IV – B shall apply.
 - b) In residential districts:
 - (i) All parking, areas of active use, play areas, communal gathering areas, and storage; whether in buildings, accessory structures, or outdoor; shall be subject to the district's setbacks as shown in Table IV – B.
 - (ii) The floor area ratio (FAR) shall not exceed 0.17
 - (iii) For a Child Care Facility: The ground area covered by the Building in which such business is located, up to 2,500 square feet, shall not exceed the Maximum % Building Coverage for the zoning district in which it is located. For a Building with a ground area coverage in excess of 2,500 square feet the floor area ratio (FAR) shall not exceed 0.17
 - c) Sky Exposure Plane: Except for the Downtown Mixed Use district; the roof of the building may not project beyond sky exposure planes determined from the lot lines in a rise : run ratio of 1:00 : 1.00.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

5. Savings Clause: If any provision, clause, subsection, or other part of Section III-A.7 shall be held to be invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Section shall not be affected thereby, but shall remain in full force and effect.”

-In Section 200 Definitions add a new definition:

“CHILD CARE FACILITY: A day care center or school age child care program as those terms are defined in 606 CMR 7.00.”

-In Section V-D. 3, add a new subsection:

“v) For nursery schools, day care and child care facilities - 1 space per 5 children the facility is licensed to serve”

-In Section III-A.2 USE REGULATIONS TABLE, add a new footnote to Uses 47, 48, & 49.

“‡ Except as such Use is otherwise exempted from permitting by Massachusetts General Laws chapter 40A, section 3, or other State or Federal statute, in which case it is subject to Section III – A.7.”



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

ARTICLE 4

Home Rule Petition – Cochituate Rail Trail Bridge Sponsorships (Town Administrator)

To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to petition the General Court to enact legislation in substantially the following form, provided that the General Court may reasonably vary the form and substance of the requested legislation within the scope of the general public objectives of this petition.

“AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE MUNICIPALITIES OF NATICK AND FRAMINGHAM TO NAME CERTAIN BRIDGES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:

SECTION 1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Chapter 85 and Chapter 30B of the General Laws, or any other general or special law to the contrary, the municipalities of Natick and Framingham are authorized to offer, execute agreements for, and receive revenues from the sponsorship of bridges crossing state highways on or along the Cochituate Rail Trail.

SECTION 2. All revenues received from said sponsorships shall be used for open space and/or park purposes.

SECTION 3. All revenues received from said sponsorships of a bridge across Route 9 shall be exclusively for the town of Natick.

SECTION 4. All revenues received from said sponsorships for a bridge across Route 30 shall be evenly divided between the municipalities of Natick and Framingham.

SECTION 5. The form, material and size of signage to be installed within any state layout pursuant to this act are subject to the approval and regulations of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation.

SECTION 6. This act shall take effect upon its passage.”

or otherwise act thereon

PURPOSE OF THE ARTICLE



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

This home rule petition seeks needed legislative authorization to effectively sell naming rights for two bridges to be constructed/reconstructed over state highways as part of the CRT, which will provide revenue to the Town and help offset the cost of the CSX acquisition and/or provide funding for future open space/parkland expenditures.

FINANCE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The sponsor provided the following information in their responses to the Finance Committee Questionnaire as well as in in-person testimony.

- Legislation is needed to allow the Town to establish – potentially in collaboration with a non-profit such as the Friends of Natick Trails, as well as with Framingham – a naming rights program for one or both bridges to be built as part of the CRT. Absent this legislation or another mechanism that circumvents existing restrictions, we will not have that opportunity
- Through those efforts the Town would realize revenue for defined goals such as open space acquisition.
- Legislation is necessary since the state has some jurisdiction;
 - Natick, together with Framingham, would seek to establish a procurement process that allows the town to maximize revenue, working in concert with MassDOT to respect their standards and practices.
- The Committee was advised that sponsorships and naming rights is an emerging area of State policy, and the Town is proposing a novel approach to this issue following consultation with MassDOT. It may be amended in the legislature, or become part of other legislation since Natick is not the only entity that would benefit.

Finance Committee learned that for the purposes of the sponsorship fund raising efforts, if the Town is doing procurement it is constrained to Chapter 30B. If a not-for-profit is driving the procurement process and bringing the sponsorships to the Town for acceptance there is no need to follow the Chapter 30B processes and regulations.

The sponsor also shared that the intention is for the Town to realize revenue to support the community's goals; the revenue would be accounted for, and appropriated with Town Meeting approval.

- The sponsor has indicated that the motion language expects that funds received for sponsorships would be targeted to Open Space funding for future open space acquisition and maintenance operating and improvement costs. Funds might also be used to pay down the debt through different means.



Town of Natick

2017 Special Town Meeting #1

May 9, 2017

The Finance Committee had two motions to consider-Referral to Sponsor and Favorable Action where the motion reflects the language of the Article. During debate members spoke to a number of points including:

- Some members strongly expressed a belief that commitments had been made to Town Meeting in the recent past that every effort would be made through the fundraising process to pay down the debt and reduce the burden on the taxpayer. The language of the motion doesn't make this explicit and lacking that members are disinclined to provide support for the motion
- Other members expressed concern on having wording that is too specific that forces only debt repayment at the exclusion of other uses for funds that could be well-used for other intended purposes
- Members do not believe that sponsorship funds should in any way be used to offset or supplant appropriations that would otherwise come from operating budgets for different departments, such as Community Services for fields and playgrounds as a means to mitigate budget shortfalls in other areas
- Members identified that while revenue received from sponsorship are held in a 'receipts reserved for appropriation' account under the authority of the selectmen it is unclear what mechanisms limit the revenue use in a manner to require appropriation by a vote of Town Meeting
- It was identified in testimony that Framingham's change to a city government creates a snafu for the timing of such a Home Rule Petition. Members were mixed on the impact of such an issue with some expressing Natick should wait until Framingham can once again explicitly support such legislation while others felt Natick should proceed and not delay starting the often lengthy legislative process, letting Framingham catch up when they can

With only thirteen members present and voting, neither motion met the necessary majority of eight (8) votes to allow a recommendation to Town Meeting.

FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Finance Committee recommends the following action supported by its vote for the motion as presented below.

Article #4	Date	Action	Vote
	May 1, 2017	No Recommendation	NA

MOTION: (requires two-thirds majority)

No Recommendation